DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 231 820 SP 022 717

TITLE	Profile of Preservice Teacher Education Programs in Florida. Report of the Surveys Conducted by the Joint Executive and Legislative Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement.
INSTITUTION	Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee.
PUB DATE	Apr 83
NOTE	67p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Information Analyses (070)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Admission Criteria; Change Strategies; *College Faculty; *Deans; *Department Heads; Higher Education; Policy Formation; *Preservice Teacher Education; Program Evaluation; Program Improvement; State Surveys; Statewide Planning; *Teacher Education Programs; Teacher Salaries; Tenure
IDENTIFIERS	*Florida

ABSTRACT

Three types of surveys were developed to obtain specific recommendations from key educational personnel for improving preservice teacher education programs. Deans, directors, and chairpersons of Florida teacher education programs provided profiles of faculty and students; the institution's standards for admission, selection, and retention of students, promotion and tenure policies; and governance procedures. Chairpersons of elementary, secondary, and exceptional student education programs identified specific program components and provided information on clinical aspects of programs, including early field opportunities, public school involvement, and student teacher experiences. Individual faculty members supplied data on professional backgrounds and experiences and involvement in staff development activities. They also described policy making procedures regarding promotion, tenure, curriculum, and program changes; and were offered an opportunity to provide ideas and suggestions for program improvement. In this report, resulting data are presented with summary comments. Survey questionnaires are also appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED231820

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda Recio

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

PROFILE OF PRESERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS IN FLORIDA

Report of the Surveys Conducted by the Joint Executive and Legislative Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement

April 1983

State of Florida
Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida
Ralph D. Turlington, Commissioner
Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

SP 022 717

FLORIDA: A STATE OF EDUCATIONAL DISTINCTION. "On a statewide average, educational achievement in the State of Florida will equal that of the upper quartile of states within five years, as indicated by commonly accepted criteria of attainment."
Adopted, State Board of Education, Jan. 20, 1981

JOINT EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE TASK FORCE
FOR TEACHER EDUCATION QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

MEMBERS

Armando J. Henriquez, Chairperson
Governor's Commission on Secondary Schools
Superintendent, Monroe County Schools

Miriam Arnold
Florida Vocational Association
Vocational Coordinator, Escambia County Schools

Ida Baker
State Community College Coordinating Board
Principal, Cape Coral High School

Wendy Cheyney
Faculty, College of Education
Associate Professor, Florida International University

Pat Frank
The Florida Senate

James Gardener
Postsecondary Education Planning Commission
Assistant to President, Nova University

Lynn Gold
Florida Association of Teacher Educators
TEC Director, Volusia County Schools

Fred Haushalter
Florida Association of School Administrators
Principal, Woodham High School

Jeffrey Hoffman
Florida Association of Teacher Educators
Associate Professor, Florida State University

Donald Jones
Chairman, State Board of Independent Colleges and Universities
Attorney at law

William Katzenmeyer, Vice Chairperson
Dean, College of Education
University of South Florida

Elizabeth Kentosh
Classroom Teacher
Niceville Senior High School

Marcia Mann
Faculty, College of Education
Associate Professor, University of South Florida

James McCartney, Vice Chairperson
Dean, College of Education
Chief Academic Officer and Dean, Biscayne College

Robert McKelvey
Florida School Board Association
Member, Okaloosa County School Board

Barbara Moore
Florida School Board Association
Member, Okaloosa County School Board

Paul Prosperi
Citizen-at-large
Attorney, Barnett & Alagia

Wray Register
Florida Education Council

MEMBERS

Samuel Ryle
Classroom Teacher
Belleview Middle School

Doris Sanders
State Advisory Committee for the Education of Exceptional Students
Director, Polk County Exceptional Student Education (Retired)

Frank Scruggs
Board of Regents
Attorney, Steel Hector & Davis

David Smith, Vice Chairperson
Education Standards Commission
Dean, College of Education, University of Florida

John Terrell
Florida Association of School Administrators
Superintendent, Hardee County Schools

Ralph Turlington
Department of Education
Commissioner of Education

Eleanor Weinstock
The Florida House of Representatives

TASK FORCE STAFF

Richard Alterman, *Project Director*

Linda Recio, *Assistant Project Director*

Sue P. Freedman

Jeffrey Sharkey

Ellen Leddy

Mariann Maender

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
TASK FORCE MEMBERSHIP		iii
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	DATA REPORTING AND COMMENTARY	3
	A. General Teacher Education Information Survey	3
	B. Department Chairperson Information Surveys	10
	C. Faculty Information Survey	20
III.	SUMMARY	32
APPENDIX		
	Task Force Surveys	33
TABLES		
	Institutional Response to Task Force Surveys	2
	Elementary Education Subject Area Components	11
	Secondary Education Subject Area Components	13
	Exceptional Student Education Subject Area Components	15

I. INTRODUCTION

The Joint Executive and Legislative Task Force on Teacher Education Quality Improvement was established by the 1982 Legislature to initiate a systematic and comprehensive study of teacher preparation programs and make policy recommendations related to improving the quality of teacher education. The legislative intent encouraged teacher educators to critically review current practices and to examine where improvements can and should be made so that teacher preparation will provide quality curriculum and teaching methods designed "to enable schools to meet the challenges of the 21st century."

Central to the Task Force effort and the development of specific recommendations on preservice teacher education programs was the counsel from faculty, program chairpersons, and deans and directors of teacher education programs in Florida. Subsequently, surveys were developed to secure this information and were distributed to:

1. Deans, directors, and chairpersons of approved teacher education programs in Florida;
2. Chairpersons of the elementary, secondary and exceptional student education programs at each institution; and
3. All teacher education program faculty members in both public and private colleges and universities.

This report represents a compilation and analysis of the three types of surveys. Copies of each of these five surveys appear in the Appendix.

Description of Surveys

A. General Teacher Education Information Survey

The dean, director, or chairperson of the teacher education program was asked to provide profiles of both faculty and students; the institution's standards for admission, selection, and retention of students; promotion and tenure policies; and governance procedures.

B. Department Chairperson Information Surveys

Each chairperson of elementary, secondary, and exceptional student education programs was sent a separate survey and asked to identify specific program components and provide information on the clinical aspects of the program including, early field opportunities, public school involvement and student teaching experiences.

C. Faculty Information Survey

Individual faculty members were asked to supply data on their professional background and experiences, and involvement in staff development activities. In addition, they were asked to describe promotion and tenure and policy making procedures on their campuses with regard to curriculum and program changes. Finally, they were offered an opportunity to provide ideas, suggestions, and comments which they had for teacher education program improvements.

Dissemination/Response

All surveys were mailed to the dean, director, or chairperson of the teacher education program on November 19, 1982. Deans were asked to disseminate the faculty and chairperson surveys at their institutions. To protect individual faculty anonymity, the faculty survey was returned directly to Task Force staff. The chairperson and dean surveys were directed to be returned from the dean's office. The due date for all surveys was December 21st. The short timeline in which to respond was considered critical as the final Task Force report was due to the legislature on March 1, 1983 and the survey data needed to be analyzed and incorporated into preliminary findings and recommendations by Task Force staff. Unfortunately, the brief time period also prevented the surveys from being field-tested sufficiently, which caused significant difficulty in interpreting certain items. These problems are cited in the section which follows.

As noted in the summary chart below, responses to the survey were secured from 81 percent of the teacher education program directors, 70 percent of the program chairpersons, and 44 percent of the preservice teacher education faculty.

FLORIDA'S TEACHER EDUCATION PROGRAMS
RESPONSE TO TASK FORCE SURVEYS*

Barry College	1 2 3 4 5
Bethune-Cookman College	2 3 4 5
Biscayne College	1 2 3 5
Eckerd College	5
Edward Waters College	
Flagler College	1 2 3 4 5
Florida A & M University	1 2 3 5
Florida Atlantic University	1 2 3 4 5
Florida Institute of Technology	1 3 5
Florida International University	1 2 3 4 5
Florida Memorial College	1 5
Florida Southern College	1 2 3 4 5
Florida State University	1 2 3 4 5
Jacksonville University	1 5
Nova University	1 2 3 4 5
Palm Beach Atlantic College	
Rollins College	1 2 3 5
Saint Leo College	1 2 3 4 5
Stetson University	1 2 3 4 5
University of Central Florida	1 2 3 5
University of Florida	1 2 3 4 5
University of Miami	1 2 3 4 5
University of North Florida	1 2 3 4 5
University of South Florida	1 2 3 4 5
University of West Florida	1 4 5
University of Tampa	1 2 3 5
Warner Southern College	5

*Code: 1 - Dean's Survey 2 - Elementary Education 3 - Secondary Education
4 - Exceptional Student Education 5. One or more faculty surveys

II. DATA REPORTING AND COMMENTARY

A. General Teacher Education Information Survey

This survey was completed by either a dean, director, or chair of a state-approved teacher education program in Florida. As indicated in the chart on the previous page, twenty-two of the twenty-seven teacher education program directors responded.

Faculty Profile - Demographics

1. Full-time faculty in the Departments/Colleges/Schools of Education:
   Assistant 182 Associate 304 Full 302 Total 788
   Tenured 743 Private institutions 123 Public institutions 665

2. Number of full-time faculty involved in teaching any preservice teacher preparation courses:
   Assistant 169 Associate 263 Full 263 Total 695
   Tenured 564* Private institutions 90 Public institutions 605

3. Of the faculty involved in teaching in the preservice teacher preparation program, number soft lines: 15

4. Number of adjunct faculty teaching preservice teacher education courses:
   Doctorate 51 Masters 130 Total 181

5. Number of faculty directly involved in supervising student teachers:
   Full-time 332 Adjunct 13 Tenured 232

6. Number of faculty involved in activities organized through Teacher Education Centers:
   Private institutions 44 Public institutions 627

7. Number of faculty trained to participate in the Beginning Teacher Program: 186

*68 of the 564 represents an estimated percentage of the University of Florida faculty since specific data was not reported.

COMMENTARY:

In analyzing the demographic data provided on faculty it was surprising to learn that 95 percent of the full-time faculty were reported to be tenured (747 out of 788). However, a comparison of full-time faculty to those involved in preservice teacher preparation programs reveals a discrepancy in the data reported by the deans and directors; that is, of the 695 faculty reported as being involved in preservice teacher preparation, only 564 or 81 percent were reported as being tenured. This inconsistency suggests that the Department of Education should periodically solicit and verify demographic data on teacher education faculty at Florida's public and private postsecondary institutions.

Private institutions appear to be utilizing adjunct faculty to a greater extent than public institutions. For example, thirty-eight percent of the

full-time faculty in private institutions were reported as adjuncts as opposed to 16 percent at public institutions. This disparity is even greater when comparing adjunct faculty in preservice teacher preparation -- 45 percent at private institutions; 15 percent at public institutions.

Forty-eight percent of the preservice teacher education program faculty were reported as being involved in supervising student teachers. However, only 41 percent (232 out of 554) of these faculty were reported to be tenured. In other words, it appears that the widely held belief that low ranking faculty are responsible for supervising student teachers as reported on this survey holds true for Florida's teacher education programs. However, it should be noted again that there appears to be an inconsistency in the data reported on tenured faculty in this category as well.

Public institutions reported that they were involved to a greater degree in Teacher Education Centers (TEC) than private institutions. Only 44 out of 123 faculty members from private institutions were reported as being involved in TEC activities. Several public institutions stated that liberal arts faculty were also included in the total number reported.

Finally, only 24 percent of the full-time faculty were reported to be trained to participate in the Beginning Teacher Program. This low percentage is expected to increase as the survey was conducted during the first few months of the implementation of the Beginning Teacher Program.

Staff Development

1. Staff development activities (listed in order of frequency):*
   a. Sabbaticals
   b. Redirection/Retraining Activities
   c. Professional meetings, workshops, seminars
   d. Research and Development grants
   e. Personal professional development opportunities.

2. Are faculty required to participate in staff development activities:
   Yes 34% No 66%

*It should be noted that the training to participate in the Beginning Teacher Program could also be considered a staff development activity.

Student Profile

1. Mean score on SAT/ACT for entering teacher education candidates:
   SAT Mean = 934 (14 institutions responded - 9 public; 5 private)
   Range = 858 to 1104
   ACT Mean = 20 (12 institutions responded - 9 public; 3 private)
   Range = 18 to 22

2. SAT scores for students entering teaching preparation programs.
   Approximately 27 percent of respondents (or 6 private institutions) did not provide this information. Of those who responded, the following range represents the percentage of students each institution reported having at each level:

SAT Scores Fall 1981		SAT Scores Fall 1982	
Below 835	1-14%	Below 835	1-12%
835 - 899	16-80%	835 - 899	2-83%
900 - 999	10-57%	900 - 999	8-58%
1000 - 1099	2-43%	1000 - 1099	2-36%
1100 or above	1-23%	1100 or above	1-23%

3. ACT scores for students entering teacher education programs.
   Approximately 41 percent of the respondents (or 9 private institutions) did not provide this information. Of those who responded, the following range in percentages was provided:

ACT Scores Fall 1981		ACT Scores Fall 1982	
16 or below	3- 33%	16 or below	1-25%
17 - 19	18-100%	17 - 19	27-97%
20 - 23	1- 45%	20 - 23	2-53%
24 - 27	4- 35%	24 - 27	11-30%
28 - 30	2- 6%	28 - 30	3-14%
31 or above	0%	31 or above	0%

4. Cumulative grade point average of junior level students enrolled in teacher preparation programs.
   Approximately 41 percent of respondents (or 9 private institutions) did not provide this information. Of those who responded, the following range in percentages was provided:

GPA Fall 1981		GPA Fall 1982	
1.9 or below	3-33%	1.9 or below	1- 7%
2.0 - 2.4	8-40%	2.0 - 2.4	7-66%
2.5 - 2.9	23-54%	2.5 - 2.9	22-54%
3.0 - 3.4	5-40%	3.0 - 3.4	10-46%
3.5 or above	4-45%	3.5 or above	5-29%

COMMENTARY:

Several private institutions indicated that this data was either not available or not readily obtainable. It was surprising to note that the data reported on the mean SAT/ACT score for entering teacher education candidates exceeded those required for admission to Florida's teacher education programs (835/17) and far exceeded those reported in recent national studies by Weaver (1979) and Vance and Schlechty (1982) to be characteristic of teacher candidates. According to the Educational Testing Service, in 1981, the average SAT score for college bound seniors intending to study in education was 809.

Standards for Admission, Selection, and Retention of Teacher Candidates

1. ADMISSION INTO PROGRAMS
   a. Do admission requirements exceed 835 on SAT or 17 on ACT required by SBER 6A-5.62?
      90% of respondents indicated they do not.

   b. If students do not meet minimum admission score, is remediation recommended?
      Yes 70% No 30%
      Types of Remediation recommended:
      Basic skills course - 17%
      Remediation Labs - 11%
      Tutorial - 8%
      Counseling - 8%
      No response - 56%

   c. Percentage of students for which SAT/ACT requirements have been waived.
      Responses ranged from 1-12%. Eighty percent of the respondents indicated less than a 5% waiver.

   d. Criteria used in determination to waive admission requirements:
      GPA evaluation - 17%
      Admissions committee recommendation - 12%
      Proximity of test scores to cut-off levels - 7%
      Miscellaneous - 16%
      No response - 47%

   e. Additional admissions requirements into teacher education program:
      Overall GPA - 35%
      Satisfactory completion of prerequisites and course completion - 17%
      Screening Test of Basic Skills - 15%
      Ongoing advisement - 12%
      Miscellaneous - 14%
      No response - 7%

   f. Will CLAST alter current requirements?
      Yes 35% No 50% No response 15%

2. SCREENING AND PLACEMENT
   a. Procedures used for screening candidates:
      ACT/SAT criteria - 25%
      General department evaluation/advisement - 20%
      GPA criteria - 15%
      Miscellaneous - 28%
      No response - 12%

b. Ongoing evaluative procedures/screening mechanisms:
Advisement/observation - 42%
GPA maintenance - 30%
Systematic process of probation, dismissal - 7%
Miscellaneous - 14%
No response - 7%

3. EXIT AND RETENTION

a. Attrition rate for students leaving the teacher education program:
Responses ranged from 2% to 40%; 35% provided no response.
Of those who leave, percentage which exit due to failure to meet academic requirements:
Responses ranged from 1% to 100%; 35% provided no response.
Percentage exit to other fields:
Responses ranged from 0% to 80%; 40% provided no response.

b. Do you require college of education exit tests?
Yes 30% No 65% No Response 5%
*Types of Tests
Proficiency/Ability tests - 15%
Competency tests - 10%
Student teaching as an assessment - 10%
Mock Teacher Certification Examination - 5%

c. Percentage of students which pass exit examination on first attempt:
Responses ranged from 11% to 100%.
Are successive attempts allowed?
Yes 40% No 10% No Response 50%
If Yes, how many?
Responses ranged from 1 to 6 times.

d. Percentage of graduates passing the Florida Teacher Certification Examination on a first attempt in 1981-82.
Responses ranged from 40% to 100%.

COMMENTARY:

Colleges of Education appear to be heavily involved in the remediation of students who do not meet entrance criteria. There does not appear to be uniform procedures across institutions for the screening and placement of teacher education candidates. A basic assumption made by each dean and director, however, is that the screening mechanism implemented at the institution is effective.

Approximately, thirty percent of the institutions responding reported a college of education exit examination in addition to the Florida Teacher Certification Examination. This percentage was higher than expected.

Promotion and Salary

Recommendations to improve salary and promotion system at your institution:

Higher tuition subsidies (private schools) - 15%
More flexible criteria for promotion and salary assessment of service oriented faculty - 10%
Retain as is - 5%
Miscellaneous - 13%
No response - 5%

Governance

1. Is there a formal group at your institution charged with responsibility for making major policy decisions effecting change in teacher education programs and curriculum?
   Yes 90% No 10%

2. The formal policy group includes representatives of (Percentages indicate the percentage of time an item was checked):
   95% department/college/school of education faculty
   90% department/college/school of education administrators
   55% liberal arts faculty
   65% liberal arts administrators
   50% institution level administrators
   65% teachers
   85% State Department of Education representatives
   65% others

3. Examples of major changes made by policy group within the last 2 year (Percentages indicate the percentage of time an item was identified):
   Admissions/evaluation requirements upgraded - 20%
   Course rearrangements/additions - 17%
   Basic skills entrance requirement - 10%
   Program restructured - 10%
   None - 10%
   No response - 15%
   Miscellaneous - 18%

4. Are the majority of changes made in teacher education programs at your institution the result of this group's activity?
   Yes 55% No 30% No response 15%
   If No, what are major forces?
   State mandates, special task force decisions, and university administrative action were cited. Seventy percent did not respond to this question.

5. Formal mechanism to encourage collaborate planning
   a. Between teacher education programs:
      Department meetings and teacher education advisory committees were cited with equal frequency; 30% provided no response.

   b. Between teacher education programs and public schools:
      Teacher Education Centers and faculty service in school districts were cited; 20% provided no response.

c. Between education faculty and liberal arts faculty:
College of education and university councils, meetings and the university senate were identified; 20% provided no response.

6. Recommendations identified to improve policy making in teacher education:

More effective use of resources - 5%
Current policy works well - 7%
Development of Teacher Education Advisory Committee - 5%
More autonomy and academic freedom - 5%
None - 5%
Miscellaneous - 30%
No response - 43%

COMMENTARY:

Most of the deans, directors and chairs of teacher education programs who responded believed that the formal policy body includes a broad representation of administrators, faculty, students, teachers, and state officials. The issue of governance was also addressed on the faculty survey which is discussed later in this report.

B. Department Chairperson Information Surveys

These surveys were directed to both public and private college/department/school of education chairpersons responsible for programmatic supervision of the three major program areas: Elementary, Secondary, and Exceptional Student Education.

The questionnaires were designed to focus on four specific substantial components which embody the professional pedagogical training given to teacher candidates so that a general profile of the process of teacher education at each institution could be developed. The four component areas examined represented those identified in the legislation as being of concern. These were:

1) the availability of pedagogical subject/topic coverage within course offerings
2) the nature of the clinical (campus-based) experience within each program
3) the nature of the early field (school-based, short duration, return to campus) experience
4) the student teacher (internship) experience.

This data has been aggregated and arranged in a narrative style to provide a general characterization of the teacher education experience at Florida's public and private institutions. On many of the responses, institutional and program variation seem to be the rule, not the exception. Variations seem to reflect judicious use of physical and human resources and each institution's unique relationship to its community. Comments have been made noting the range of responses offered. In general, however, responses seemed to cluster in patterns suggesting uniformity across institutions within similar program areas and within institutions across program areas as well.

The data will be reported and analyzed below within the component areas and subdivided into elementary education, secondary education, and exceptional student education programs. Nineteen institutions responded to the elementary program survey; twenty institutions responded to the secondary program survey; and fifteen institutions responded to the exceptional student program survey.

Subject Area Coverage

ELEMENTARY (Table 1)

From Table I, it can be seen that most of the major subject area or topical issues are addressed to some extent within program coursework. The heaviest subject emphasis across institutions seems to be placed upon contemporary issues, text quality assessment, classroom organization and management, evaluation, planning, and student behavior management, which perhaps could be considered as the core of conventional pedagogical practice. Other areas received almost as much attention - learning disabilities, multicultural education, and PL-142 - ostensibly reinforced by statuatory support for coverage in these areas. Expanding interest in computer education, educational technology, global education, and inner city education reflect an interest by teacher educators to enhance prospective teacher's sensitivity to contemporary social and technical issues in schooling and education.

TABLE 1
ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

1 = 5-49% of course time spent on subject
2 = 50-100% of course time spent on subject

	FSU	UF	USF	UCF	FAMU	UNF	UWF	FIU	FAU	U Tampa	Rollins	Biscayne	FIT	Flagler	St Leo	Barry	Bethune-Cookman	Stetson	Fla South	U Miami
1) Contemporary Issues in Education	1	1	1	2	1	1		2	1	2	2	1		1	2	1	2	2	1	2
2) Computer Literacy	1	1	2	2				1		2	2						2	2		2
3) Economic Education		1	1	1	1	1		1	1		1	1				1	1	1	1	
4) School Law	1		1	1		1		1		2	1			1	1				1	1
5) Environmental Education	1	1			1	1		1	1		1				1	1	1	1	1	
6) Sex Education		1	1		1									1	1		1			
7) Multicultural Education	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1		2	1		1	1		1	1	1	2
8) Urban Inner city Education	1	1		1	1	2		1	1		2	1		1	1				1	1
9) Learning disabilities	1	1	1	1	2	1		2	1	1	2			1	2		1	1	2	2
10) Counseling for classroom teachers					1	1			1			1			1				2	
11) Global International Education		1		1	1			1				1			1	1	1			
12) Teacher stress burnout	1	1	1	1	1	1			1	1				1	1	1	1		1	
13) Educational Technology	1	1		1	1	1		1	2	2	1			1	2				1	2
14) Assessment of quality in texts	1	1	2	1	1	1		1	1	1		1		1	1	1			1	
15) Classroom Organization and Administration	2	1	1	1	2	1		1	1	1		1		1	1		2	1	1	1
16) Evaluation	1	1	2	1	1	2		2	2	2		1		1	2	1	2	1	2	2
17) Verbal and non verbal communication	1	1	1	1	1	1		2	1		2	1		1	1	1	1	2	1	1
18) Presentation of subject matter	2	1	1	1	2	2		2	1	2		2		1	1	1	1	2	2	1
19) Bilingual Education		1			2	1		2	1	1				1	1	1			1	
20) Management of Student Behavior	1	1	1	1	1	2		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	2	2
21) Coursework planning	1	1		1	1	1		1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1	1	
22) Gifted Student Education		1	1	1	2	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	2	1		1	1	1
23) P L 94-142	1	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1		1	2
								(1)					(1)	(2)		(2)				

(1) No responses given
(2) Percentages not available

SECONDARY (Table 2)

The most heavily emphasized topic coverage appears to be in the areas of: contemporary issues, industrial technology, classroom organization, evaluation, presentation of subject matter, and management of student behavior. The least emphasized areas are economics, sex education, global and international education, and teacher stress. Computer literacy appears to be sparsely considered across institutions, but it appears that strong emphasis is given to it where and when it is addressed in the course of studies.

It must be mentioned that many of these subjects are covered in multiple course offerings and the stipulated level of emphasis noted on the table is subject to variation in practice and should not be viewed as an absolute level. As general trends, however, they do suggest that the breadth of subject information conventionally perceived as appropriate and necessary for adequate professional preparation is indeed extensive. Adequate coverage of such areas requires a substantial commitment of time and resources if they are to be done well. The level of coverage depicted in Table 2 may strike a satisfactory balance for some. However, if policy makers and teacher educators continue to expect that this mixture of course content should form the basis for future teacher education programs, then no additional subjects should be placed on the program's curriculum agenda. Furthermore, this pedagogical component of teacher education may have to be compressed to address these issues more efficiently and effectively. Otherwise institutions may have to thin out the range of offerings and devote singular emphasis to those areas that will give the greatest return in terms of teacher excellence.

TABLE 2
SECONDARY EDUCATION

1 = 5-49% of course time spent on subject
2 = 50-100% of course time spent on subject

	FSU	UF	USF	UCF	FAMU	UNF	Nova	FIU	FAU	U. Tampa	Rollins	Biscayne	FIT	Flagler	St. Leo	Barry	Bethune-Cookman	Stetson	Fla. South	U Miami
1) Contemporary Issues in Education			1	1	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1		2
2) Computer Literacy		1	2	2			2		1	2			2				2	2		2
3) Economic Education		2	1			1	1						1				1		1	
4) School Law			1	1	2	1	1			2		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
5) Environmental Education		1	1			1	2		1		1	1			1				1	2
6) Sex Education			1				1	2				1		1	1		1			1
7) Multicultural Education		2	1			1	1	2	1			1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1
8) Urban Inner city Education		1		1	1	2	1		1		2	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1
9) Learning disabilities		1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1		1	1	1	2	1	1	2	2	1
10) Counseling for classroom teachers					1	1	1				1	1			1		1	2	2	1
11) Global International Education		1		1				2				1			1					
12) Teacher stress burnout		1				1	1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1			1	1
13) Educational Technology		1	1	1	1	1	2		1	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2
14) Assessment of quality in texts		1	1	1		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
15) Classroom Organization and Administration		1	1	1	1	1	2		1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2
16) Evaluation		1	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	2	2
17) Verbal and non verbal communication		1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	1
18) Presentation of subject matter		1	2	1	1	2	2		2	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	2
19) Bilingual Education		2				1	2			1		1		1	1		1			
20) Management of Student Behavior		1	1	1	1	2	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	2
21) Coursework planning		1	1	1	1	1	2		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	1
22) Gifted Student Education			1	1		1	1			1	2	1	1	1	2		1	1	1	2
23) P.L. 94-142		1	1							1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
	(1)											(2)		(2)		(2)				

(1) Program is content specific, could not give specific responses
(2) Percentages not available

EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT (Table 3)

Exceptional student programs vary across and within institutions for several reasons. Programs at many colleges and universities are four year baccalaureate degree programs; at other institutions they are extended programs beginning a four year undergraduate program with an additional one year master's degree. Usually, they are self-contained due to the specific training requirements of the particular exceptional child emphasis area; other times these programs act as supplements to regular elementary education training. For these reasons, there appears to be diversity across institutions with respect to the responses of questions on this survey.

From the outline of subject area coverage depicted on Table 3, it can be seen that the heart of exceptional student education curricula focuses on coursework planning, management of student behavior, evaluation, presentation of subject matter, and verbal and non-verbal communication. Educational technology and the required contemporary issues in education followed closely behind in emphasis.

It is impractical to make comparisons between this table and those for elementary and secondary education programs; but a cursory glance might suggest that prospective exceptional education teachers receive more exposure to such pedagogical topics as counseling for classroom teachers and educational technology due to the perception that the instructional role of these teachers is more individual contact-oriented and clinical in practice. The emphasis placed on evaluation most certainly reflects the tremendous amount of teacher time required to complete the individual evaluation profiles mandated for students in exceptional student education programs.

The tabulation displayed cannot draw out the subject emphasis to each of the specific areas of study subsumed within the exceptional student category. If differences do exist between program specializations, further analysis would be necessary to highlight this.

TABLE 3
EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION

1 = 5-49% of course time spent on subject
2 = 50-100% of course time spent on subject

	FSU	UF	USF	UNF	UWF	FIU	FAU	Flagler	St Leo	Barry	Bethune-Cookman	Stetson	Fla South	Miami	Nova
1) Contemporary Issues in Education	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	1		1	1	2
2) Computer Literacy		1	2		2			1		2				1	2
3) Economic Education	1									1			1		1
4) School Law	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1
5) Environmental Education	1	1				1			1	2	1		1		2
6) Sex Education		1	1		1	1	1	1	1		2				1
7) Multicultural Education	1	1	2		1	2	1	1	1	1	1		1	2	1
8) Urban Inner city Education	1		1		1	2	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1
9) Learning disabilities	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	
10) Counseling for classroom teachers	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1				1		1
11) Global International Education						1			1		1		1		
12) Teacher stress burnout		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1				1	1	1
13) Educational Technology	1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	1		1	1	2
14) Assessment of quality in texts	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1		1
15) Classroom Organization and Administration	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
16) Evaluation	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
17) Verbal and non verbal communication		1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	1	2	1
18) Presentation of subject matter	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	2		
19) Bilingual Education					1	2	1	1	1					1	
20) Management of Student Behavior	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	2	2	2
21) Coursework planning	2	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	2		1
		(3)						(2)				(1)			(4)

(1) Exceptional student program is supplementary to regular elementary education
(2) No percentages available
(3) Graduate courses not included
(4) Graduate program entirely

Clinical Components and Early Field Experiences

Because of the similarities in the clinical and early field experiences and overlap in the responses received in the three program surveys, the data summarization on these two components have been combined in this section.

ELEMENTARY

The types of clinical experiences available to students at various institutions were depicted as follows (number in parenthesis reflect frequency with which this activity was mentioned): mini teaching (3), laboratory observation and participation (3), reading diagnostic labs (3), tutorial (2), and general observations (5). The length of clinical practices ranged from 4 to 90 hours per semester. Approximately 90% of such experiences are offered to students at the junior and senior level. Several private institutions indicated that clinical, campus-based experiences were not part of their program; facilities were not available for such activities.

Elementary programs seem to provide school-based, early field experiences as the major form of "clinical" learning activities for students. As mentioned above, campus-based clinical practices are not offered as extensively across institutions. It may be the case that program supervisors view the distinction between campus-based and school-based activities artificial. The provision of activities which combine practice and observation both on campus and on schools may be more of an integrated, rather than bifurcated, process than we anticipated. The structure of the questionnaire may have forced these responses to conform to this, possibly artificial, distinction.

About one half of the institutions require students to participate in clinical experience prior to student teaching. The number of hours stipulated by these programs to fulfill their requirements ranged from 4 to 48, with most falling within the 15 to 30 hour range.

In general, it appears that formal clinical practice does not provide a major preparatory basis for pedagogical theory and subsequent teacher preparation practices in elementary education programs throughout Florida. This does not mean that levels of clinical experience are insubstantial within any one particular program, but as a measure of degree, this survey would highlight a lack of universal incorporation of the clinical experience into program curriculum.

Early field experiences represent "hands-on" observational and teaching activities taking place within the school classroom where the prospective teacher is allowed to measure the relevancy and effectiveness of strategies learned in the university classroom. Optimally, early field experiences should coincide with theory and strategy-based pedagogy courses and build on clinical experience to provide a forum for the exchange of ideas, observations, and micro-experimentation. Program supervisors see early field experiences as more important than clinical experiences.

From the survey, a variety of types of early field experiences exist, varying in locale and duration, but in general the typical experience is embodied in a "methods/practicum" type course providing approximately 80 to

120 hours of school-based experience for teacher candidates. The range of such early field requirements (clinical experience was occasionally included in this figure) was from 49 hours per student to 400 hours per student over the course of training. This practice usually occurs at the junior/senior level of the program although 3 of the 19 respondents have structured this experience to commence at either the freshman or sophomore year.

During the typical experience, consultation between school-based teachers and university supervising teachers occurs approximately once a week or 12 to 16 times a semester for approximately thirty minutes each.

Consultation between the university supervisors and the pre-intern practicing student was typically a combination of individual conferencing and university classroom/seminar interaction averaging 45 minutes of person to person contact or small group per week.

It appears that early field experiences are multicultural in nature (75 percent, yes; 25 percent, no). Often, this is formally structured in student placement to schools, but in general, it seems to occur because area schools within which students practice are multicultural in composition.

The combined clinical and early field experience activities seem to represent an integral, yet moderate, portion of the teacher preparation experience. It is difficult to tell from this survey how and to what extent these practical practices are woven into the fabric of the total professional preparation experience. The degree of articulation and linkage between subject area content, pedagogical theory, and strategy formation, and application of these in practice within a controlled, supervised, and formatively--evaluated context, represent critical questions of organizational balance and program effectiveness that further study might help to illuminate.

SECONDARY

Six of the twenty institutions which responded do not offer clinical teaching experiences for their students. Those that do, offer such activities as micro-teaching, tutoring, workshops on behavior management and coursework planning, and general observation and participatory practice.

The duration of such experiences range from 3 hours per semester to 40 hours; the average is approximately 20 hours. Most are offered at the junior and senior level (Note: Several incomplete responses to this question may be due to a typographical error in the questionnaire).

A large variety of early field experiences exist across secondary education programs. Seventeen of the twenty institutions offer activities which are structured as some combination of observation and participation. The duration of early field experiences range from 12 hours per semester to 200 with most programs clustering in the 50 to 80 hours/semester range. In four institutions, these activities are initiated at the freshman or sophomore level.

University-based supervisory professors spend on the average 6 hours/semester consulting with their school-based counterparts.

Students are evaluated by observations, pre-formulated checklists of competencies (55%), and professional judgement (30%). Individual and small group conferences form the basis of professor-student interaction during these activities, generally amounting to four or five individualized contact hours throughout the semester.

It appears that this experience is multicultural in nature for 65 percent of students participating, because most host schools enjoy a pluralistic student body.

EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT

It appears that clinical practice subsumes a larger proportion of program space in exceptional student education than it does in the other two program areas. The various practicum/lab experiences listed range from 10 to 150 hours, clustering in the 40 to 60 hour range. Most of these activities are scheduled within the junior/senior level of program coursework.

Similar emphasis seems to be placed on early field experiences for exceptional student prospective teachers. All institutions offer substantial child-contact activities; ranging from 40 to 360 hours over the course of professional preservice training. Most programs offer between 80 to 150 hours of hands-on, school-based experience. Generally, these activities are structured at the junior and senior levels, although three programs initiate field experiences at the freshman or sophomore years. The required early field experiences prior to student teaching range from 75 hours to 390 hours. Most requirements fall within the 120 to 200 hour range.

Contact between university supervisory staff and school-based supervising teachers average 4 hours per semester. Consultation between students participating in early field experiences and their supervising professors take the form of individual conferences, small group seminars, phone conversations, and letters. Such individual contacts appear to be an average of 6 to 8 times per semester for about 20 to 30 minutes each. Half of the student placements in multicultural classroom environments.

Student Teaching

ELEMENTARY

The profile of the student teaching experience for most students parallel closely the guidelines suggested by state regulations. Generally, the internship experience lasts for 1 semester (or quarter as the case may be--10 to 14 weeks); full-time and supervised by a school-based teacher. This approximates, on the average, 350 hours of hands-on practice. For elementary teachers, the experience is usually confined to one school. However, it was reported that students often have experience at more than one grade level.

Typically, the university supervisory professor will meet with interns seven times for 45 minutes each in the school setting over the course of the semester or quarter. Often, however, the placement dispersion of students throughout the state from some institutions severely limits the contact and evaluation time between intern and supervising professor.

The student teaching experience for the average elementary intern in Florida is multicultural in nature, basically because school districts themselves are pluralistic in composition. However, almost half (45 percent) of elementary teacher education programs do not formally structure their internships to include this type of diverse exposure.

SECONDARY

Here again, the character of student teaching activities conform very closely to the state suggested quidelines. Almost all ranged from between 10 to 16 weeks, although two institutions only require an eight week experience. One school requires two-ten week sessions for its students. Generally, such experiences take place in only one school (75%); often at more than one grade level (60%); and depending upon discipline area, across more than one subject matter area.

University faculty supervising teachers contact their school-based counterparts on an average of eight hours per semester. It appears that university-based supervisors make strong efforts to maintain contact with their student interns in the field. Conferences occur usually four times a semester for approximately two hours, and provide both student and faculty an opportunity to discuss problems and keep abreast of the student's progress. Obviously, placement of students in schools distant from the university makes frequent contact more difficult. It seems from this survey that university supervisors make strong and conscientious efforts to observe, consult with, and evaluate student interns.

Approximately two-thirds of the schools have no formal requirement for ensuring a multicultural internship experience. Again, however, most directors assert that the experiences are richly pluralistic due to the ethnic/racial diversity of most school districts.

EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT

Student teaching experiences appear very uniform in length, ranging from 10 to 16 weeks, and most are within the 14 to 16 week range. Forty percent of these internships take place in more than one school, 55 percent work with children representing more than one grade level, and most deal with student concerns across a variety of subject areas.

Supervisory professors maintain contact with school-based supervisory teachers frequently and on the average five to seven times per semester. Individual conferences and observation provide the basis for intern-supervising professor contact. Generally, these occur six to ten times a semester. It appears that the relatively smaller numbers of students in exceptional student education programs provides more contact time between professor and student in the field. This is contingent, however, upon the size of the faculty supervision staff and placement dispersion of interns.

Again, little formal attempts are made to ensure a multicultural experience for interns, but due to the diversity of most school populations, this exposure is available for about 65 percent of the interns.

C. Faculty Information Survey

Included below are the categories and frequencies reflecting the responses to the Task Force Faculty Survey. Following a telephone survey to determine numbers of college of education faculty at each institution, approximately 900 faculty surveys were mailed statewide to both public and private institutions. These surveys were mailed to the 27 deans and chairs of teacher education programs with instructions to distribute the survey only to faculty involved in preservice teacher education. Obviously not all 900 faculty are involved in preservice teacher education exclusively; many work in related and graduate education programs. The total response of 400 surveys (44% of 900; 58% of the 695 faculty reported in dean's survey to be involved in preservice teacher education) was made up predominately of teacher education faculty which reflected their interest in contributing to the information base for teacher education in Florida.

Abridged comments from the faculty surveys have been included below to provide a richer, more insightful description of faculty response to the questions of policy recommendations, promotion and salary, and general recommendations for improvements in teacher education. Faculty anonymity has been maintained throughout this process. The Task Force thanks all those who took the time to express their views on these issues.

Teaching and Administrative Experience

1. Do you have public school teaching experience?
   Yes 89% No 11%

2. If so, how many years full-time?
   1-5 years 46% 6-10 years 29% Over 10 years 25%

3. Grade levels taught?
   Elementary 29% Middle 12% Secondary 18%
   Some combination of above: 27% Adult Education 9%
   University 2% N/A 11%

4. What subjects taught?
   Elementary 18% English 7.5% Mathematics 8%
   Social Studies 6% P.E./Health 5% Science 5%
   English/Social Studies 5% Miscellaneous combinations 34.5%
   No response 11%

5. Public school administration experience?
   Yes 31% No 69%

6. If so, how many years full-time?
   1-5 years 73% 6-10 years 18% more than 10 years 9%

7. If so, at what level?
   Elementary 28% Middle 4% Secondary 28%
   Miscellaneous combinations 37% University 3%

8. Private school teaching experience?
   Yes 24% No 76%

9. Do you currently hold valid Florida teaching certificate?
   Yes 36% No 64%

COMMENTARY:

A surprising high percentage of faculty (89%) reported having public school teaching experience. However, the majority of such experience (46%) was for less than 5 years and only a small percentage (36%) currently hold a teaching certificate. Subjects and grade levels taught varied across the board. Only 31 percent of the faculty had public school administration experience.

Staff Development

1. Did you participate in staff development activities last year?
   Yes 72% No 28%

2. If you did participate in these activities, please classify them by type of activity:

20%	Training related to the beginning teacher program
34%	Seminar/workshop
2%	Sabbatical
12%	State conference
13%	National/International Conference
2%	Research and Development
9%	Computer training
7%	Personal professional development

COMMENTARY:

Although most faculty (72%) indicated that they had participated in staff development during the past year, the activities varied and few generalizations can be made. The low number of sabbaticals and attendance at conferences was surprising. This can most likely be attributed to the lack of funds for these staff development activities.

Policy Making Procedures

1. Are procedures for making major policy decisions regarding changes in teacher education programs effective at your institution?
   Yes 57% No 43%

2. What recommendations would you make for improving these procedures? (Major recommendations grouped below--also see faculty comments)

10%	1.	Improved communications between and within Colleges of Education/Universities and public schools
5%	2.	More faculty input into process
5%	3.	Increased authority of Schools/Colleges/Departments of Education in universities
16%	4.	Miscellaneous
64%	5.	No response.

COMMENTARY:

Faculty respondents are in general agreement with comments made by the deans, directors, and chairs of teacher education programs. However, with 43 percent of the faculty indicating that major policy decisions regarding changes are ineffective, it was disappointing to see that 64 percent of the respondents offered no solutions for improving these procedures. This lack of response suggests that the widely held notion that college of education faculty are unable to agree on a blueprint for reform is true in Florida as well.

FACULTY COMMENTS ON POLICY DECISIONS:

Dynamic leadership with a vision is needed. Every decision goes to a committee and is debated for months-even years. Then no action.

I recommend that the administrators making decisions regarding teacher education programs consult directly with the faculty teaching in such programs. These faculty are familiar with the curriculum and students in these programs. Too frequently, faculty teaching in teacher education programs do not get an opportunity to participate in discussions or decisions affecting their discipline.

Union regulations as well as tenure and budget limitations do not allow university to staff as program changes. Suggest eliminating tenure, provide for early retirement without undue penalty (20 years) and provide for budget flexibility - carry over savings from one fiscal year to the next.

My department works as a committee of the whole. We all have incredible input into all policy decisions. We discuss and search until we reach consensus. Every competency in our special education programs has been agreed upon by all eight of us. We have agreed on their placement in particular courses and when we find we have made a mistake we re-examine the issue and modify it as need be. Our program is far from static. Every time we think we have it the way we want it, we get another idea and try something new. At times it may seem that our department doesn't know what it wants, but we do. We want excellence and we will continue to make changes necessary to assure that excellence. Progress at the College level is slower because so many more people and ideas are involved, but I am presently involved with a committee working on revision of our Core Courses required of all students and I feel we are making great progress.

There has been a progressive and invasive presence by the DOE. Change in teacher education has been from the DOE down. The DOE changes reflect a concern with minimum standards, to the expense of higher standards. The result? A craft mentality worthy of such weight mechanics: anti-intellectual, stultifying, mindless, bureaucratic, degrading busy work. The Dewey Decimal System of Generic Objectives keyed to generic test items is no more teaching than drawing by the numbers is art. Its not so much what is on the tests that scares me, its what is not in the generic objectives and test items. Injecting a form of scholasticism into instruction and tracking it by computer will drive the bright and imaginative minds out. Research may not be the answer to everything, but right now it offers at least one answer. Bright teachers are dropping out faster than the kids. They hate the instructional straight-jacket being weaved; they hate the "You can't trust the teacher"

mentality of a "teacher-proof curriculum". The research-base for education has been cast aside in favor of a monstrous management system. A brilliant curriculum will not save students from a stupid teacher, but a brilliant teacher can save students from a stupid curriculum. The teacher will put it aside. Or, leave in disgust. Right now they are leaving. Educational problems require educational, not managerial solutions. Right now we need bright teachers more than ever. And, bright people cost money to attract and keep, even if this is missionary work. Education's monopoly of bright women is all over. Teaching's salary structure can only attract mindless hacks. The teacher will not get more money; the teacher will get more numbered, magical flapdoodle; the public will get more drop-outs for its high tech society; and, Colleges of Education will get the blame. My apologies for sounding so testy, but nobody has even bothered to ask before. Thanks for your interest.

None, why change what works.

Major policy decisions are not hard to make, being sure they are actually implemented is much more of a problem.

The College of Education is not "master in its own house". It exists in an environment controlled by central administrators whose image of what a college of education ought to be is at variance with what the societal needs are. The status quo is enforced through central budget control. They need (we need) budget control and program control in order to become responsive to society.

The process of major policy decisions tends towards the innocuous. Our academic vice-president seems genuinely interested in teacher education, but forces within and outside of the university often dictate the policy direction of the moment. What is needed is deep reflection and action. However, too many vested interests are on either side of the reform process. Within the School of Education there is inertia for the status quo. Perhaps it will tumble before the new dean...

You're no doubt aware of the major change being made in restructuring of our college (the proteach effort). While most of the faculty favor the move to an extended program and/or restructuring, the efforts over the last two years to do this have met with great resistance and even enmity. The reasons are complex enough to require a much lengthier essay, but they boil down (I think) to, a basic distrust between faculty and administration as well as a whopping communication problem.

The College needs a policy advisory committee made up of teachers, administrators, school board members, etc. from various parts of the State who meet on campus quarterly to monitor and advise the Dean and faculty about policy. We have an excellent Dean but he can't be all things to all people. We need an associate dean who can get things done on campus.

Blow up the teacher certification department in Tallahassee, limit any education major to 45 semester hours in education, and require computer and foreign language literacy.

Promotion and Salary Decisions/Criteria

1. In your opinion, are the promotion and salary decisions at your institution made on appropriate criteria?
   Yes 46% No 40% No Response 14%

2. If no, what change would you suggest? (major suggestions listed below--also see Faculty comments)
   - 9% 1. Improve the clarity, fairness, and objectivity of criteria and ensure consistency in application of criteria.
   - 9% 2. Ensure a balanced emphasis on research, teaching, and service.
   - 7% 3. More individualized assessment focusing on task-specific duties
   - 10% 4. Other/Miscellaneous
   - 65% 5. No response

COMMENTARY:

Although 40 percent of the respondents indicated that promotion and salary decisions were not made on appropriate criteria, 65 percent provided no response as to what changes could be made to ensure that the criteria were more appropriate.

FACULTY COMMENTS ON PROMOTION/SALARY:

In print our criteria appear quite equitable but in reality inequities abound. The following represent a few suggestions: 1) evaluate faculty based on assigned duties (not just the number of articles published), and 2) recognize that many faculty in teacher education programs continue to carry heavy teaching and service loads. Therefore these types of activities should receive serious consideration during the promotion process. Certainly publications are an important part of our professional development, but for faculty who spend the majority of their professional time in teaching and service accommodations must be made in order to reward these efforts too.

The stated criteria are teaching, research and service. In reality research is all that really matters. People should be promoted on the basis of excellence in any one of the three, and average or better in one of the other two.

Too much emphasis is placed on "publishing". I am an expert educator. I have devoted my life to teaching and doing an excellent job of it. I could give a rats ass about publishing...the literature is full of enough "junk" for promotion articles. I have taught 25 years both in public and university levels schools. Teaching is my art, my craft, not publishing. However, unless I publish I'll remain an assistant professor no matter what my teaching skills, my leadership in my state and national professional organizations, etc. It is not just.

Much emphasis now is given to student evaluations of courses without any attempt to correlate the evaluation of individual students by the instructor.

at one time, faculty members were told to believe that student evaluations would not be used to evaluate faculty for promotions and salary increases. The criterion of research still maintains an unusually strong hold on all evaluations with the departmental and college committees. Not much emphasis is given to one's participation in his/her professional association conferences and activities (often at a substantial cost to the faculty members since they are reimbursed periodically only for travel). In recent years salary increases were so small that these criteria were of little importance.

Criteria for promotion should be multi-dimensional. Its important to have specialists in all three areas of teaching, research and service. Proportions should be based on the degree to which an individual achieves in the role he/she plays in the department. Let individuals who are strong in research be rewarded for research activities and those strong in service be

---

Model for promotion (teaching, service, research) geared mainly for arts and science and business faculty. Needs of College of Education faculty are quite unique as we work closely with schools and should be evaluated individually.

I'd suggest less whinning by some faculty because they cannot be promoted to full professor after doing two teacher workshops in Two Egg, FL!

Recommendations for Improving the Quality of Teacher Education Programs in Florida

List some suggestions you have for improving the quality of teacher education programs in Florida? (Major suggestions listed below--also see commentary and faculty comments)

6% 1. Recruit higher quality candidates
6% 2. Require more and earlier clinical experiences for students
4% 3. Increase resources to teacher education programs
3% 4. Greater emphasis on liberal arts education for students in teacher education
37% 5. Other/Miscellaneous (19 response categories)
44% 6. No response

COMMENTARY:

While the scientific validity of open-ended comments is questionable, the insights gained from their review remain worthwhile. A cursory examination shows clearly that there is little consensus in the type of changes suggested by faculty as what may be required for quality improvement in teacher education. There was great difficulty in even trying to characterize the responses. Perhaps this is caused by the very nature of open-ended response questions.

Three general observations, however, can be drawn. First, a number of faculty believe programs would be more professional if the state allowed them to have more control over programs. The arcane and large volume of credentialing requirements, unenlightened legislator involvement, and lack the of stability in state educational policy were frequently cited. Second, higher standards for teachers were deemed necessary to fight the crisis in

teacher competence. These suggestions included increased standards for certification, program admissions, the teacher certification examination and subject matter comptetence. Also, better and more frequent academic screening mechanisms throughout the entire teacher preparation process were urged as a way to keep standards high. Simply put, academic and scholarly rigor seemed most important. Third, a significant number (approximately 6 percent) of faculty stated that early and more frequent clinical and field experiences were essential to any process aimed at improving the quality of teacher education programs. These suggestions also included closer cooperation with the public schools and financial renumeration for school-based supervisors of students.

Any attempt to quantify these responses would be impossible if not misleading. It is important however to understand the general mood of teacher education faculty in Florida. For this reason, the following selected responses to this open-ended question are reproduced below.

FACULTY COMMENTS ON RECOMMENDATIONS FOR QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS:

Let individual university programs establish criteria for their majors. Recent requirements of courses in reading in content areas, mainstreaming, and measurement all have added hours to our students' programs with little evidence of their practicality, importance or need when they actually begin teaching.

Settle on programs that do to need to be changed every year. When we went through the ballyhooed "Full Year Internship" fiasco, we added courses to get ready for the change. When money wasn't funded, we pulled back to our old programs but kept the new courses on the books. At about the same time we changed to the semester system, which required complete revisions of existing programs. Every year we are being asked to change another element or phase of our teacher education programs.

Cut down on the number of hours required for social and philosophical foundations of education. Consider offering the hours as TV programs.

Require content areas to offer their own curriculum course, rather than having another course taught by education generalists or theoreticians. A history education professor is better equipped to each the course for his/her major than someone in foundations.

More emphasis needs to be placed on teaching future teachers to know more about how learning takes place from within the individual learner's perception. Most teachers know plenty about their respective subject matter...what they don't seem to know is now to get their students to want to learn what the teacher knows. This can be done by teaching the teacher how people learn and that they learn differently...uniquely their own individual way. This requires a teacher who understands human behavior and learning styles in addition to having an adequate knowledge of their subject matter.

Better pre-education: sociology, anthropology, political science, psychology, etc. More general education for elementary majors. More methodology and curriculum development for secondary.

The College of Education or university could provide funds for staff development seminars/workshops for faculty teaching in these programs. (Ex: writing workshops, micro computer workshops, etc.)

The College of Education or university could provide travel funds for faculty to attend conferences and seminars in order to remain current in their field. At the present time, travel funds are restricted primarily to faculty presenting papers at conferences.

Continue the screening procedures (Reading, Writing & Mathematics) currently in operation in the College of Education at the undergraduate level. This process represents a significant effort to select only high quality people for teacher education programs.

Provision for individual universities to pilot program without restrictions of the system. Currently it takes approximately two years for new program approval-by that time, flexibility is lost. Upgrade entrance requirements, without worry.

A much more equitable plan for faculty inservice work. The year long sabbatical is not practical for most in today's economy...more of the one-semester leaves and short term studies must be made available. Summer sessions could be included in the time for sabbaticals now that budgets are devastating our summer programs.

Professors need to work together across disciplines to strengthen programs. Instruction should model innovations especially those made possible by technological advances.

Raise current course standards for grades and stick to them (as opposed to adding more coursework). There are 25% or more students who should not be teaching our kids of the future. More "Loops" to jump and pay for will not improve the quality of the product.

Ignore the teacher certification examination when designing programs. Reflect upon it after programs have been developed, thus not allowing the minimums defined by the State because we have maximums for our future teachers.

Less meddling by legislators who do not have the background to make the decisions they are making. Laws will not improve the quality of programs - salaries to attract qualified teacher educators will improve quality of programs.

Increase entry requirements - SATs, etc. Early entry into field-based experiences. Five-year extended programs. Increase subject matter competence. Provide for multicultural teacher preparation. Prepare candidates for professional functions that are required to achieve excellence (Not to meet some obsolete certification requirements), based on continuing research data.

Provide some sort of education for the state legislature. The repercussions in teacher education programs due to legislative bumbling of such well-intentioned, yet only parbaked items as the post-baccalaureate teacher exam, the year-long internship and the beginning teacher plan have kept us in a miasma of time and energy-consuming false starts and reversals. Two or three years ago, students honestly did not know what to expect from one week

to the next from the changing regulations in the year-long internship proposal.

Seek greater community involvement and support. Seek greater industry involvement and support. Seek greater parental involvement and support.

Stop issuing legislative mandates which continue to add hours and alter the nature of the training programs. Give financial, not lip service, to the use of field based experiences. Provide remuneration for public school teachers who work with preservice students.

Teacher programs need to be autonomous. The quality of the "product" (graduating teachers) should be a primary criteria. Teacher training programs should be encouraged to provide a variety of offerings, a variety of methodology, and a maximum of choice. Fundamental, however, is that they be funded in a manner which will allow them to be more exclusive and raise standards of entry. Minimizing state required certification requirements will make it possible for schools of education to raise standards, not lower them...in that students will be freer to take liberal arts courses to supplement their understandings/backgrounds as would also be required and evaluated.

Deny entrance to teacher education programs to students who cannot comprehend what they read, or who cannot write. Rather than use writing tests as remedial instruments, they should be used to deny entrance to programs. I continue to be appalled by the number of university students who cannot write one coherent sentence. It is wrong to encourage them to continue in our programs. They should come to us with these basic skills intact.

Improvement in cooperative efforts between public schools - particularly classroom teachers and principals - and university faculty in working to bring about change.

More careful screening of students selected for admission to teacher candidacy. Improvement in the content of liberal arts courses required for General Education - more attention to fine arts. Teachers should be decision makers, problem solvers, and creative thinkers in order to stimulate these attributes in their students. The courses that they take in "teaching preparation" should provide the opportunities for them to develop these abilities.

One program for each subject area is not enough. We have to give a different type of training to those going into urban schools from what is given the rest. We should encourage all college students to take an introduction to education course as freshmen; those interested in continuing should get some "teaching" experience as sophomores so they will know early whether they want to continue. More field experience is essential at all levels. Evaluation should be made of the various units within each of the teacher education courses to see how beneficial they are to effective practice. Let various colleges - public and private - have a couple of specialities and give special slate and to making these really top-notch programs.

Keep the four year teacher education programs (do not try the fifth year program; we will drive too many of the better students away). But promote the support system for new teachers. Extend the beginning teacher support system to three years, but do not tie it to certification. The system of local

decision for certification is disrupting the concept of support and continued professional development for beginning teachers.

Limit admission to persons with 1000+ SAT. Require 12 semester hours undergraduate mathematics. Require 12 semester hours undergraduate English (6 in grammar, 6 in literature). Secondary majors should have 90 hours in speciality areas and adequate score of 80 percentile on rigorous criterion-referenced exit examination. I think Dean Smith's Operation Proteach has merit if it can be installed.

Be careful not to penalize our Florida teacher graduates! They are the best trained (or some of the best)! Reward them for going into teaching by equalizing the opportunity for a job.

Provide and require all professors to return to public school teaching once every 5 years. Eliminate the junior college - upper level university structure.

Within the university and college, add a lower division to enable our majors to make wise use of electives, and to begin professional coursework earlier. Encourage humanities and science majors to minor in education to provide this option to students as well as to develop a pool of qualified and certifiable teachers.

At the state level raise the subject area requirements for certification gradually over a period of time. Encourage competency with the microcomputer for certification at all levels.

It is not possible to legislate quality teacher education programs. Obviously, legislative guidelines are necessary, but details must be worked out by the profession. As with other professions, quality requires dedicated leadership and self-policy by the professionals themselves.

First, the legislators and state education officials are to be commended for taking the initial steps in improving the quality of teacher education programs by implementing the Florida Teacher Certification Examination and the research-based performance evaluation system reflected in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program.

The implications for quality improvement of the undergraduate preservice teacher education are inherent in the Florida Beginning Teacher Program. It seems to me that:

-systematic collaboration between the State Board of Education commissions/task forces, public school systems, and colleges of education is necessary if quality of preservice teacher education is to result. Perhaps a process for collaboration could be established. The student teaching program becomes increasingly important.

Providing master teachers for every student teacher the universities must be able to place student teachers with an appropriate supervising teacher. The supervising teacher should be chosen based on set criteria and they should be reimbursed monitarily for the task. At present, the school system places the student teachers which can result in unqualified teachers doing the supervising. Student teachers under the current system are not always chosen by the supervising teacher for professional reasons.

Elementary special certificate areas should be developed. For example, certificates should be given for "elementary, with a speciality area of math" (or social studies, science, language, reading, etc.) By doing so, we would require that teachers generate a base of knowledge in one area.

Provide time and funding for carefully designed staff development.

We need to recognize the vital role of our colleagues in the profession (elementary/secondary professionals) in planning and implementing professional teacher education programs.

Require student teaching to be part of an internship year, which would also involve heavy study of the problems of teaching as an intellectual issue. (Observations and mini-course teaching might be made part of the undergraduate program. But what is needed and what is possible in preservice training is a more rigorous look at the "knowledge base" of teaching - and a criticism of that notion itself.) Don't try to make the pre-service programs do something that is better done in the schools - and vice versa.

Each university be required to present a plan by January 1985.

Each department in the colleges of education be required to submit its plan to the university-wide committee chaired by the Academic Vice-President; the administration of the college of education be treated as equivalent to a department and not have any advantage.

The FTP-NEA plan, Excellence in our Schools: Teacher Education be incorporated in the deliberations at each university.

A separate component be developed by the Florida Department of Education to modify existing laws and to accommodate the changes.

The number and variety of methods courses be reduced; core and foundational courses in social, philosophical, statistical, psychological areas be the bridge between liberal arts and the college of education.

More statewide publicity about careers in teaching (sponsored by state department).

Ongoing course development with faculty, student, and administrative input. More university-wide emphasis placed on quality of teaching and advising students.

Establish internship centers to provide consistency between the internship and the on-campus program. Establish model learning environments (classroom plus related instructional materials and equipment) for each subject area. Provide resources for the conduct of research related to teacher education.

Change the certification requirements to accept courses based on content rather than levels. (i.e., presently the College of Arts and Sciences must supply science content). Educators cannot ensure the courses meet the needs of the teachers. School of Education professors can deliver much of the appropriate science content needed by teachers, but are prohibited from doing so by the need for an Arts and Science label for certification. Science content needs to come also from the other professional schools in the university.

Ultimately, teacher education needs to become a graduate professional degree removed from undergraduate school. Potential teachers should earn a liberal arts degree and then enroll in a two-year professional degree program roughly equivalent to a J.D. or M.D. No solutions other than band-aid measures are possible until we improve the public image and salaries of teachers. When teaching becomes attractive, we will be able to recruit better candidates.

Reducation of FTE expectations is a must if we are to improve teacher education. In fact, we should move away from FTE driven formulas to one which permits high quality programs to be developed. Of course, we must also improve the reward system for one aspiring to and entering into the teaching professions.

Dismantle the State Department of Education. They are kingdom building. Far too many people with no specific direction or goal (or competence!) Certification requirements in some fields are antiquated - makes decent program development difficult.

Less mandates from Tallahassee that are geared toward eliminating those persons who cannot score on "TESTS" but are capable of becoming good to excellent teachers. Do away with tenure so that ineffective teachers can be guided toward other disciplines. And, have less administrators and more good teachers--too many teaching lines are filled with administrators.

Eliminate all undergraduate course and program offerings in education. Make a B.A. prerequisite for teacher degree/certification program. Make colleges of education truly accountable/responsible by giving them total responsibility for what they do. As matters now stand, most of a student's program is determined by agencies outside the college so we can blame difficulties on them. Can't continue to claim that teachers cannot read and write as long as the College of Liberal Arts says they can. We must be honest about who is teaching teachers and who is not. Put the responsibility, and the control, where we usually place the blame.

III. SUMMARY

The Task Force was pleased with the interest shown by faculty, program chairpersons, and administrators in private and public preservice teacher education institutions throughout Florida. A response rate of over 70 percent for most of the Task Force questionnaires was certainly significant for mail surveys of this type, especially in view of the short time frame given for the task and lack of follow-up in securing responses.

The open-ended, candid comments provided meaningful insight into the entangling network of preservice teacher education including such bodies as the legislature, Department of Education, Board of Regents, college of education and public and private universities. The frustrations expressed by both faculty and administrators were often times synonomous, especially in the areas of a university's lack of commitment to, and criticism of, teacher education and also state-mandated rules and regulations.

The Task Force suggests that much of the data gathered in these surveys be updated and verified periodically by Department of Education officials so that an accurate profile of Florida's preservice teacher education programs can be maintained. It was noted that much of this statewide statistical and informational data was unobtainable prior to the development of the surveys. However, it should be mentioned, that the Task Force's surveys must be redesigned before they are again disseminated to postsecondary institutions.

Finally, the Task Force believes that the information obtained from these surveys provided valuable data which was used in the development of several Task Force recommendations in the areas of university commitment to teacher education, staff development for college of education faculty, faculty involvement in public schools, subject matter and field experiences in preservice teacher education programs, and promotion and tenure decisions. These recommendations are contained in the March 1983 Task Force report entitled Improving the Quality of Teacher Education in Florida.

Appendix

TASK FORCE SURVEYS

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION
KNOTT BUILDING
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301

Telephone (904) 488-0981

TASK FORCE FOR
TEACHER EDUCATION
QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

November 19, 1982

Dear Dean, Director, or Chairperson of Teacher Education Program:

It is anticipated that during the 1983 legislative session serious attention will be given to teacher preparation programs in Florida. The Joint Legislative and Executive Task Force on Teacher Education Quality Improvement was established and requested by the 1982 Legislature to provide a report with legislative and policy recommendations by March 1, 1983. At present the Task Force is in the process of securing data on Florida's teacher education programs from a variety of sources. Given our short time-frame, it is the intent of the Task Force to obtain and provide to the legislature the most accurate information available on Florida's preservice teacher education programs. The counsel from faculty, program heads, and deans and directors of teacher education programs is essential as the group begins to develop and establish recommendations.

As part of this activity we request and urge you to complete the attached white survey for deans, directors, or chairs of teacher education program. In addition, we have enclosed a pink survey for you to give to the chairperson of your elementary education program; a blue survey for you to give to the chairperson of your secondary education program; and a green survey for you to give to your exceptional student education program. Further, a faculty survey is being sent to you under separate cover for each faculty member at your institution.

As you know, our deadline of March 1, 1983 is rapidly approaching. Therefore, we would certainly appreciate your assistance to encourage faculty and program chairpersons to complete their instruments. The Task Force plans to share the results of the survey upon completion and will protect the confidentiality of all faculty so concerned.

Please return the completed instruments in the enclosed envelope by December 21st. Mail them to: Dr. Richard Alterman, 109 Knott Building, Tallahassee, FL 32301.

If you should have any questions please call Dr. Alterman at 904-488-0981.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Armando Henriquez

Dr. Armando Henriquez, Chairperson
Task Force for Teacher Education Quality Improvement

AH/rca/mm

Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

GENERAL TEACHER EDUCATION INFORMATION

(To be completed by Dean, Director or Chair of Teacher Education Program)

NOTE: If you do not possess the specific information requested, please so indicate. If the information requested is not now available, but you can estimate, please do so and indicate that the response is an estimate.

Name of Institution _____

Name, Title, Address of Dean of School College of Education

_____

_____

_____

A. Faculty Profile

1. How many full-time faculty are in your Department/College/School of Education?

   Assistant _____ Associate _____ Full _____ Tenured _____

2. How many of these faculty have: Doctorate _____ Masters _____

3. How many of these faculty are involved in teaching any preservice teacher preparation courses?

   Assistant _____ Associate _____ Full _____ Tenured _____

4. Of the faculty involved in teaching in the preservice teacher preparation program, how many are on soft lines? _____

5. How many adjunct faculty are teaching preservice teacher education courses?

   Doctorate _____ Masters _____

6. How many liberal arts faculty are directly involved in delivering preservice teacher education courses? _____

7. How many faculty are directly involved in supervising student teaching?

   Full-time _____ Adjunct _____ Tenured _____

8. How many faculty are involved in activities organized through Teacher Education Centers?

   Assistant _____ Associate _____ Full _____ Adjunct _____ Tenured _____

9. How many faculty have been trained to participate in the Beginning Teacher Program? _____

10. Which staff development policies do you have?

Sabbatical _____ Redirection _____ Other (please describe) _____

_____

11. Are faculty required to participate in staff development activities?
Yes _____ No _____

B. Student Profile

1. What is the mean score on SAT _____ or ACT _____ for your entering teacher candidates?

2. Of those students entering teacher preparation courses in the Department/College/School of Education in Fall 1981 who took the SAT Exam, how many earned a score of:

Below 835	_____
835 - 899	_____
900 - 999	_____
1000 - 1099	_____
1100 or above	_____
Total	100%

3. Of those studetns entering teacher preparation courses in the Department/College/School of Education in Fall 1982 who took the SAT Exam, how many earned a score of:

Below 835	_____
835 - 899	_____
900 - 999	_____
1000 - 1099	_____
1100 or above	100%
Total	

4. What percentage of your students entering teacher preparation programs in the Department/College/School of Education in the Fall 1981 who took the ACT Exam, earned a score of:

16 or below	_____
17 - 19	_____
20 - 23	_____
24 - 27	_____
28 - 30	_____
31 or above	_____
Total	100%

5. What percentage of your students entering teacher preparation programs in the Department/College/School of Education in the Fall 1982 who took the ACT Exam, earned a score of:

16 or below	_____
17 - 19	_____
20 - 23	_____
24 - 27	_____
28 - 30	_____
31 or above	_____
Total	100%

41

6. What percentage of your junior level students enrolled in teacher preparation programs in the Department/College/School of Education in the Fall 1981 had a cumulative GPA in the range of:

1.9 or below	_____
2.0 - 2.4	_____
2.5 - 2.9	_____
3.0 - 3.4	_____
3.5 or above	_____
Total	100%

7. What percentage of your junior level students enrolled in teacher preparation programs in the Department/College/School of Education in the Fall 1982 had a cumulative GPA in the range of:

1.9 or below	_____
2.0 - 2.4	_____
2.5 - 2.9	_____
3.0 - 3.4	_____
3.5 or above	_____
Total	100%

Standards for Admission, Selection and Retention of Teacher Candidates

1. Admission into Programs

   a. State Board of Education rule 6A-5.62 requires a minimum composite score of 835 on SAT or 17 on ACT as a prerequisite for admission into teacher education. Does the admission score required by your institution exceed this minimum level? (Yes/No) _____.
   If YES, state the composite score(s) which your institution requires for admission into Teacher Education. _____

   b. If students do not meet minimum admission score requirements, is remediation recommended? (Yes/No) _____. If YES, describe how remediation opportunities are provided.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   c. For what percentage of your students, if any, have these SAT/ACT requirements been waived? _____

   d. What criteria do you use in determining to waive these requirements?

   _____

   _____

   _____

e. What is the racial/ethnic composition of those students for whom these requirements have been waived (% of Blacks, Whites, Hispanics, Native Americans, Asians)?

_____

_____

_____

f. What additional admission requirements does your institution require for entry into the teacher education program (e.g. minimum grade point average, basic skills competencies, etc.)? Please describe briefly.

_____

_____

_____

g. In your opinion, do you believe the CLAST test will have an effect on your current requirements or the quantity and caliber of students entering your teacher education program? (Yes/No) _____. If YES, please describe.

_____

_____

_____

2. Screening and Placement

a. Describe the procedure(s) you presently use for screening candidates who wish to enter your teacher education program.

_____

_____

_____

b. Once admitted to a teacher education program, do you employ any ongoing evaluative procedures or screening/guidance mechanisms to insure teacher candidate quality (e.g., periodic interviews, tests, observations, GPA maintenance levels)?

_____

_____

_____

3. Exit and Retention

a. What is the attrition rate for students leaving the programs of teacher education at your institution? _____. Of those who leave, what percentage exit due to failure to maintain minimum academic requirements? _____. What percentage exit to pursue other fields of study? ____.

b. Do you require exit tests for completion of your programs in teacher education? (Yes/No) _____. If YES, what types of tests do you employ?

_____

_____

_____

c. What percentage of students pass your exit tests on first attempt? _____. Do you allow successive attempts? (Yes/No) _____. If YES, how many? _____.

d. On the first attempt in 1981/82, what percentage of graduates from your programs of teacher education pass the Florida Teacher Certification Exam? _____.

D. Promotion & Salary

1. Please provide a copy of policy guidelines regarding promotion, salary, tenure and merit pay at your institution.

2. What recommendations would you suggest to improve the salary and promotion system at your institution? (Attach additional sheet if necessary)

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

E. Governance

1. Is there a formal group at your institution charged with responsibility for making major policy decisions effecting change in teacher education programs and curriculum? (Yes/No) _____.

2. If, YES do members of that group include representatives of: (check all that apply)

_____ department/college/school of education faculty

_____ department/college/school of education administrators

_____ liberal arts faculty

_____ liberal arts administrators

_____ institution level administrators

_____ students

_____ teachers

_____ State Department of Education representatives

_____others (please specify)_____

_____

_____

3. Please provide examples of major changes within the last two years made as a result of activities of this policy group.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

4. Are the majority of changes made in teacher education programs at your institution the result of this group's activity? (Yes/No) _____. If NO, what are the major forces contributing to change?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

5. What formal mechanisms are used to encourage collaborative planning?

   a. Between your teacher education programs? _____

   _____

   _____

   b. Between teacher education programs and public schools? _____

   _____

   _____

   c. Between education faculty and liberal arts faculty? _____

   _____

   _____

6. What recommendations would you make to improve the policy-making and collaborative activities in your teacher education programs?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Please complete the items on the attached pages concerning programs in elementary education on your campus. If you have no specific programs in elementary education, please so indicate below and return the forms uncompleted.

Please be as brief and specific as possible. If you do not possess the specific information requested, please so indicate. If the information requested is not now available, but you can estimate, please do so and indicate that the response is an estimate.

Please complete this section at your earliest possible convenience and return the completed form to the office of the dean, director, or chair of teacher education so that it can be mailed together with the other sections of the teacher education survey to Task Force staff, no later than December 21, 1982.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Name of Institution _____

We have programs in elementary education:

Yes _____ (Please complete attached pages)

No _____ (Please return form uncompleted)

Name, Title, and Office Address of Person Completing This Section

_____

_____

_____

Telephone _____

SURVEY OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

I. How many upper level liberal arts courses are available for students in your program?

Electives _____ Required _____

II. Please list the appropriate course number within which the following subject areas are taught or specifically addressed. If they are not covered, please mark N/C.

AREA	Prefix and Course or N/C	% of Time in Course Spent on Topic
1) Contemporary Issues in Education		
2) Computer Literacy		
3) Economic Education		
4) School Law		
5) Environmental Education		
6) Sex Education		
7) Multicultural Education		
8) Urban/Inner-city Education		
9) Learning disabilities		
10) Counseling for classroom teachers		
11) Global/International Education		
12) Teacher stress/burnout		
13) Educational Technology		
14) Assessment of quality in texts		
15) Classroom Organization and Administration		
16) Evaluation		
17) Verbal and non-verbal communication		
18) Presentation of subject matter		
19) Bilingual Education		

20) Management of Student Behavior _____ _____

21) Coursework planning _____ _____

22) Gifted Student Education _____ _____

23) P.L. 94-142 _____ _____

III. The following questions concern CLINICAL, EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCES, and STUDENT TEACHING/INTERNSHIP. To the best of your ability, would you please briefly describe the typical experience of elementary education students for the categories listed below:

A. Clinical (campus-based) experiences

Type	Total Hours	Credit	Academic Level Offered (e.g. 1st semester junior year)

1. How many hours of clinical teaching are required prior to student teaching/internship? _____

B. Early Field Experiences (school-based, short duration and return to campus)

If you provide this type of pre-intern experience, please respond to the following:

Type	Total Hours	Credit	Academic Level Offered (e.g. 1st semester junior year)

1. How are school-based supervising teachers selected?

_____

_____

_____

2. On the average, how many hours of contact occur between the school-based supervising teacher and the university-based supervisory professor?

_____

3. How are students in early field experiences evaluated by supervising teachers? (e.g., checklist of competencies, professional judgement, etc.)

_____

_____

4. How often, and in what manner, do university supervising professors consult individually with students?

   a. Type of consultation? _____

   b. With what frequency and for how long? _____

5. Are students required to do early field experiences in multi-cultural school settings? (Yes/No) _____.

   If YES, what is the nature of this requirement?

_____

_____

_____

6. How many hours in early field experiences are required prior to student teaching internship?

_____

C. Student Teaching/Internship

Please answer the following questions regarding the scope and character of your student intern program. We realize it is difficult to generalize to all students, so when answering please approximate the typical experience encountered by your interns.

1. What is the nature of the student intern experience?

   a. Duration of experience? _____

   B. Number of hours required per semester/qtr? _____

2. On the average, does this experience take place in more than one school? (If so, how many schools)

_____

3. Does it take place within one or more grade levels? (Please specify number of grade levels)

_____

4. Does it cover more than one subject matter area? (Please specify subject matter(s) taught)

_____

_____

5. What are the criteria used for placing student interns in schools? (e.g. random allocation, student selection of school, etc.)

_____

_____

6. What criteria are used by school-based personnel to evaluate interns? (please list or attach copy of criteria)

_____

_____

7. How are school-based supervisory teachers selected?

_____

_____

8. On the average, how many hours of contact occur between a school-based supervising teacher and university supervisor?

_____

9. How much, and what kind, of contact occurs between a student intern and the supervising university professor?

   a. Type of contact (e.g., meetings at student's school)

   _____

   _____

   b. Frequency and length of contacts?

   _____

   _____

10. Do you have requirements that insure student interns have a multicultural student teaching experience?

_____

If so, what are those requirements?

_____

_____

_____

SURVEY OF SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Please complete the items on the attached pages concerning programs in secondary education on your campus. If you have no specific programs in secondary education, please so indicate below and return the forms uncompleted.

Please be as brief and specific as possible. If you do not possess the specific information requested, please so indicate. If the information requested is not now available, but you can estimate, please do so and indicate that the response is an estimate.

Please complete this section at your earliest possible convenience and return the completed form to the office of the dean, director, or chair of teacher education so that it can be mailed together with the other sections of the teacher education survey to Task Force staff, no later than December 21, 1982.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Name of Institution _____

We have programs in secondary education:

Yes _____ (Please complete attached pages)

No _____ (Please return form uncompleted)

Name, Title, and Office Address of Person Completing this Section

_____

_____

_____

Telephone _____

SURVEY OF SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRSMS

I. Please list the appropriate course number within which the following subject areas are taught or specifically addressed. If they are not covered, please mark N/C.

AREA	Prefix and Course or N/C	% of Time in Course Spent on Topic
1) Contemporary Issues in Education		
2) Computer Literacy		
3) Economic Education		
4) School Law		
5) Environmental Education		
6) Sex Education		
7) Multicultural Education		
8) Urban/Inner-city Education		
9) Learning disabilities		
10) Counseling for classroom teachers		
11) Global/International Education		
12) Teacher stress/burnout		
13) Educational Technology		
14) Assessment of quality in texts		
15) Classroom Organization and Administration		
16) Evaluation		
17) Verbal and non-verbal communication		
18) Presentation of subject matter		
19) Bilingual Education		

20) Management of Student Behavior _____ _____

21) Coursework planning _____ _____

22) Gifted Student Education _____ _____

23) P.L. 94-142 _____ _____

III. The following questions concern CLINICAL, EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCES, and STUDENT TEACHING/INTERNSHIP. To the best of your ability, would you please briefly describe the typical experience of elementary education students for the categories listed below:

A. Clinical (campus-based) experiences

Type	Total Hours	Credit	Academic Level Offered (e.g. 1st semester junior year)

1. How many hours of clinical teaching are required prior to student teaching/internship? _____

B. Early Field Experiences (school-based, short duration and return to campus)

If you provide this type of pre-intern experience, please respond to the following:

Type	Total Hours	Credit	Academic Level Offered (e.g. 1st semester junior year)

1. How are school-based supervising teachers selected?

_____

_____

_____

2. On the average, how many hours of contact occur between the school-based supervising teacher and the university-based supervisory professor?

_____

3. How are students in early field experiences evaluated by supervising teachers? (e.g., checklist of competencies, professional judgement, etc.)

_____

_____

4. How often, and in what manner, do university supervising professors consult individually with students?

   a. Type of consultation? _____

   b. With what frequency and for how long? _____

5. Are students required to do early field experiences in multi-cultural school settings? (Yes/No) _____.

   If YES, what is the nature of this requirement?

_____

_____

_____

6. How many hours in early field experiences are required prior to student teaching internship?

_____

C. Student Teaching/Internship

Please answer the following questions regarding the scope and character of your student intern program. We realize it is difficult to generalize to all students, so when answering please approximate the typical experience encountered by your interns.

1. What is the nature of the student intern experience?

   a. Duration of experience? _____

   B. Number of hours required per semester/qtr? _____

2. On the average, does this experience take place in more than one school? (If so, how many schools)

_____

3. Does it take place within one or more grade levels? (Please specify number of grade levels)

_____

4. Does it cover more than one subject matter area? (Please specify subject matter(s) taught)

_____

_____

5. What are the criteria used for placing student interns in schools? (e.g. random allocation, student selection of school, etc.)

_____

_____

6. What criteria are used by school-based personnel to evaluate interns? (please list or attach copy of criteria)

_____

_____

7. How are school-based supervisory teachers selected?

_____

_____

8. On the average, how many hours of contact occur between a school-based supervising teacher and university supervisor?

_____

9. How much, and what kind, of contact occurs between a student intern and the supervising university professor?

   a. Type of contact (e.g., meetings at student's school)

   _____

   _____

   b. Frequency and length of contacts?

   _____

   _____

10. Do you have requirements that insure student interns have a multicultural student teaching experience?

_____

If so, what are those requirements?

_____

_____

_____

SURVEY OF EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Please complete the items on the attached pages concerning programs in exceptional student education on your campus. If you have no specific programs in exceptional student education, please so indicate below and return the forms uncompleted.

Please be as brief and specific as possible. If you do not possess the specific information requested, please so indicate. If the information requested is not now available, but you can estimate, please do so and indicate that the response is an estimate.

Please complete this section at your earliest possible convenience and return the completed form to the office of the dean, director, or chair of teacher education so that it can be mailed together with the other sections of the teacher education survey to Task Force staff, no later than December 21, 1982.

Thank you for you cooperation.

Name of Institution _____

We have programs in exceptional student education:

Yes _____ (Please complete attached pages)

No _____ (Please return form uncompleted)

Name, Title, and Office Address of Person Completing this Section

_____

_____

_____

Telephone _____

1. How are school-based supervising teachers selected?

_____

_____

_____

2. On the average, how many hours of contact occur between the school-based supervising teacher and the university-based supervisory professor?

_____

3. How are students in early field experiences evaluated by supervising teachers? (e.g., checklist of competencies, professional judgement, etc.)

_____

_____

4. How often, and in what manner, do university supervising professors consult individually with students?

   a. Type of consultation? _____

   b. With what frequency and for how long? _____

5. Are students required to do early field experiences in multi-cultural school settings? (Yes/No) _____.

   If YES, what is the nature of this requirement?

_____

_____

_____

6. How many hours in early field experiences are required prior to student teaching internship?

_____

C. Student Teaching/Internship

Please answer the following questions regarding the scope and character of your student intern program. We realize it is difficult to generalize to all students, so when answering please approximate the typical experience encountered by your interns.

1. What is the nature of the student intern experience?

   a. Duration of experience? _____

   B. Number of hours required per semester/qtr? _____

2. On the average, does this experience take place in more than one school? (If so, how many schools)

_____

3. Does it take place within one or more grade levels? (Please specify number of grade levels)

_____

4. Does it cover more than one subject matter area? (Please specify subject matter(s) taught)

_____

_____

5. What are the criteria used for placing student interns in schools? (e.g. random allocation, student selection of school, etc.)

_____

_____

6. What criteria are used by school-based personnel to evaluate interns? (please list or attach copy of criteria)

_____

_____

7. How are school-based supervisory teachers selected?

_____

_____

8. On the average, how many hours of contact occur between a school-based supervising teacher and university supervisor?

_____

9. How much, and what kind, of contact occurs between a student intern and the supervising university professor?

   a. Type of contact (e.g., meetings at student's school)

   _____

   _____

   b. Frequency and length of contacts?

   _____

   _____

SURVEY OF EXCEPTIONAL STUDENT EDUCATION PROGRAMS

I. How many upper level liberal arts courses are available for students in your program?

Electives _____ Required _____

II. Please list the appropriate course number within which the following subject areas are taught or specifically addressed. If they are not covered, please mark N/C.

AREA	Prefix and Course or N/C	% of Time in Course Spent on Topic
1) Contemporary Issues in Education		
2) Computer Literacy		
3) Economic Education		
4) School Law		
5) Environmental Education		
6) Sex Education		
7) Multicultural Education		
8) Urban/Inner-city Education		
9) Counseling for classroom teachers		
10) Global/International Education		
11) Teacher stress/burnout		
12) Educational Technology		
13) Assessment of quality in texts		
14) Classroom Organization and Administration		
15) Evaluation		
16) Verbal and non-verbal communication		
17) Presentation of subject matter		
18) Bilingual Education		

19) Management of Student Behavior _____ _____

20) Coursework planning _____ _____

III. The following questions concern CLINICAL, EARLY FIELD EXPERIENCES, and STUDENT TEACHING/INTERNSHIP. To the best of your ability, would you please briefly describe the typical experience of elementary education students for the categories listed below:

A. Clinical (campus-based) experiences

Type	Total Hours	Credit	Academic Level Offered (e.g. 1st semester junior year)

1. How many hours of clinical teaching are required prior to student teaching/internship? _____

B. Early Field Experiences (school-based, short duration and return to campus)

If you provide this type of pre-intern experience, please respond to the following:

Type	Total Hours	Credit	Academic Level Offered (e.g. 1st semester junior year)

10. Do you have requirements that insure student interns have a multicultural student teaching experience?

_____

If so, what are those requirements?

_____

_____

_____

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION PLANNING COMMISSION
KNOTT BUILDING
TALLAHASSEE, FLORIDA 32301

TASK FORCE FOR
TEACHER EDUCATION
QUALITY IMPROVEMENT

Telephone (904) 488-0981

November 19, 1982

Dear Faculty Member:

It is anticipated that during the 1983 legislative session serious attention will be given to teacher preparation programs in Florida. The Joint Legislative and Executive Task Force on Teacher Education Quality Improvement was established and requested by the 1982 Legislature to provide a report with legislative and policy recommendations by March 1, 1983. At present the Task Force is in the process of securing data on Florida's teacher education programs from a variety of sources. Given our short time-frame, it is the intent of the Task Force to obtain and provide to the legislature the most accurate information available on Florida's preservice teacher education programs. The counsel from faculty, program heads, and deans and directors of teacher education programs is essential as the group begins to develop and establish recommendations.

As part of this activity, we are asking you to complete the items on the attached faculty survey. Part A of this survey asks for data on your personal background and experiences. Part B requests that you provide your perceptions on the policy making procedures at your institution with regard to curriculum and program changes, and also asks you to share your perceptions on promotion and tenure procedures at your institution. The results of this survey will be shared with all deans, directors, and chairpersons of teacher education programs. INDIVIDUAL FACULTY ANONYMITY WILL BE PROTECTED.

Please complete this survey by December 21st and mail it in the enclosed envelope to: Dr. Richard Alterman, Project Director, 109 Knott Building, Tallahassee, FL 32301.

We do realize that this is a busy time of year; however, our deadline for submitting a report to the legislature is rapidly approaching.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Armando Henriquez

Dr. Armando Henriquez, Chairperson
Task Force for Teacher Education
Quality Improvement

AH/rca/mm

Affirmative action/equal opportunity employer

FACULTY SURVEY

Name of Institution _____

Name, Title of Office _____

Address of Person Completing this Survey _____

_____

Telephone _____

Part A

1. a. Do you have public school teaching experience? yes _____ no _____

   b. If so, for how many years full-time? _____

   c. If so, at what grade level(s) did you teach? _____

   _____

   d. If so, what subject(s) did you teach? _____

   _____

2. a. Do you have public school administration experience? yes _____ no _____

   b. If so, for how many years full-time? _____

   c. If so, at what level? elementary _____ secondary _____ middle _____

3. Do you have any private school teaching experience? yes _____ no _____

4. Do you currently hold a valid Florida teaching certificate? yes _____ no _____

5. Briefly describe the staff development activities in which you were enrolled as a participant during the past year. (Do not include those which you conducted).

   _____

   _____

   _____

Part B

1. Are the procedures for making major policy decisions regarding changes in teacher education programs effective at your institution? (Yes/No) _____.

   What recommendations would you suggest for improvement?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

2. In your opinion, are the promotion/salary decisions at your institution made on appropriate criteria? (Yes/No) _____. If NO, what changes would you suggest?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

3. List the suggestions you have for improving the quality of the teacher education programs.

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____